



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/726,986	12/03/2003	David I. Suda	D0932-00383	5088
8933	7590	07/23/2007		
DUANE MORRIS, LLP IP DEPARTMENT 30 SOUTH 17TH STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-4196			EXAMINER GRAVINI, STEPHEN MICHAEL	
			ART UNIT 3749	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/23/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/726,986	Applicant(s) SUDA ET AL.	
	Examiner Stephen Gravini	Art Unit 3749	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 June 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,7,8,10-16 and 20-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,7,8,10-16 and 20-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 8, 16, 22, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In this application, the claimed "conveyor system disposed within said curing tower," "moving the insulation within the curing oven tower," "vertically and horizontally within the curing tower," "serpentine path within a curing oven tower," and a "path having at least one turn such that said is longer than a distance between said entrance and exit of said curing oven" are not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Those claim recitations are construed to be new matter not supported by the originally filed application.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by over Lostak et al. (US 2,830,648). Lostak discloses

a curing oven tower **32** for heating an uncured or partially cured insulation mat (wherein the “for heating” recitation is considered a statement of intended use)

a plurality of vertical oven zones comprising heat sources or at least one heat source for heating a space within said curing oven defined between an entrance and an exit to said curing oven (please see column 3 line 60 through column 4 line 5 for the expressly disclosed heat sources), and

a conveyor system disposed within said curing oven, said conveyor system arranged to define a path for said insulation mat to travel through said space, said path having at least one turn such that said path is longer than a distance between said entrance and exit of said curing oven or a conveyor system disposed within said curing oven tower comprising a plurality of pairs of counter rotating conveyors **30, 26** arranged to move said mat through said plurality of vertical oven zones for curing, said mat being disposed between said counter rotating conveyor.

Claims 8 and 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Toumlin (US 2,758,952). Toumlin discloses moving an uncured or partially cured insulation through a curing oven tower, said oven curing tower comprising a plurality of vertical oven zones comprising heat sources, said moving step including the step of moving the insulation mat vertically within the curing oven tower through the plurality of vertical oven zones for curing in figure 1. Toumlin also discloses the claimed path

vertically overlaps itself, the moving step includes the step of conveying said insulation mat with a plurality of conveyors disposed to move the insulation mat both horizontally and vertically through the oven tower, a plurality of pairs of counter rotating conveyors that cooperate to move the mat through the oven tower, and top to bottom recirculating air in figure 1.

Claims 16, 20-27, 29, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Unsworth (US 2,341,130). Unsworth discloses a curing oven tower **D** for heating an uncured or partially cured fiberglass insulation mat (wherein the "for heating" recitation is considered a statement of intended use), said curing oven tower comprising

a heat source **25** and

a conveyor system **29, 29a, 29b** disposed within said curing oven tower comprising cooperable pairs of counter-rotating conveyors arranged for moving said insulation mat both vertically and horizontally through said curing oven tower in a serpentine path; or alternatively:

moving an uncured or partially cured insulation both horizontally and vertically within a curing oven tower comprising a heat source on page 2 lines 5-70. Figure 4 of Haddox is considered to show the claimed vertical path overlapping itself. Unsworth also discloses the claimed recirculating means on page 2 lines 14-35, overlapping serpentine vertical path in figure 4, horizontal and vertical movement within the oven tower on page 2 lines 5-70 and shown in figure 4, cooperable counter rotating

Art Unit: 3749

conveyors overlapping itself also in figure 4, recirculating air on page 2 lines 14-35, and nip zone in figure 4.

conveyor perforations at column 2 lines 17-18 wherein foraminous belt is considered perforated to one skilled in the art moving an uncured or partially cured insulation through a curing oven tower both horizontally and vertically in a serpentine path through a curing oven tower comprising a heat source as shown in figure 4.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lostak in view of Unsworth. Lostak discloses the claimed invention, as rejected above, except for the claimed horizontal and vertical movement vertically overlapping itself and recirculating means. Unsworth, another insulation manufacturing system discloses horizontal and vertical movement vertically overlapping itself and recirculating means, as discussed in the anticipatory rejection above. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Lostak with the horizontal and vertical movement vertically overlapping itself and recirculating means, as disclosed by Unsworth, for the purpose of providing a maximum surface of optimal heating and curing within a tower.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lostak in view of Fleissner (US 3,413,731). Lostak discloses the claimed invention, as rejected above, except for the claimed top to bottom recirculating means. Fleissner, another mat curing system, discloses a top to bottom recirculating means at column 3 line 47 through column 4 line 79. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to

combine the teachings of Lostak with the top to bottom recirculating means, disclosed in Fleissner, for the purpose of using a fluid to facilitate a curing process.

Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Unsworth. Unsworth discloses the claimed invention, as rejected above, except for the claimed fiberglass. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Unsworth with fiberglass, since the teachings of Unsworth would perform the invention as claimed regardless of the material claimed.

Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lostak in view of Patel et al. (US 6,357,504). Lostak discloses the claimed invention, as rejected above, except for the claimed nip zone. Patel, another mat curing system, discloses a nip zone at column 12 lines 22-65. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Lostak with the nip zone, disclosed in Patel, for the purpose of using a zone to facilitate a curing process.

Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lostak in view Haddox (US 2,830,648). Lostak discloses the claimed invention, as rejected above, except for the claimed perforations. Haddox, another mat curing system, discloses a perforations at column 2 lines 17-18. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Lostak with the perforations, disclosed in Patel, for the purpose of using a zone to facilitate a curing process.

Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Toumlin in view Haddox. Toumlin discloses the claimed invention, as rejected above, except for

Art Unit: 3749

the claimed perforations. Haddox, another mat curing system, discloses a perforations at column 2 lines 17-18. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Toumlin with the perforations, disclosed in Patel, for the purpose of using a zone to facilitate a curing process.

Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Unsworth in view Haddox. Unsworth discloses the claimed invention, as rejected above, except for the claimed perforations. Haddox, another mat curing system, discloses a perforations at column 2 lines 17-18. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Unsworth with the perforations, disclosed in Patel, for the purpose of using a zone to facilitate a curing process.

Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lostak. Lostak discloses the claimed invention, as rejected above, except for the claimed number of turns. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Lostak with any number of turns, since the teachings of Unsworth would perform the invention as claimed regardless of the number of turns claimed.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed March 27, 2007 have been fully considered but they are moot on the grounds of the new rejections.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen Gravini whose telephone number is 571 272

Art Unit: 3749

4875. The examiner can normally be reached on normal weekday business hours (east coast time).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven B. McAllister can be reached on 571 272 6785. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SMG
July 17, 2007

